



Protein Sequencing with an Adaptive Genetic Algorithm from Tandem Mass Spectrometry

Jean-Charles Boisson, Laetitia Jourdan, El-Ghazali Talbi, Christian Rolando

► To cite this version:

Jean-Charles Boisson, Laetitia Jourdan, El-Ghazali Talbi, Christian Rolando. Protein Sequencing with an Adaptive Genetic Algorithm from Tandem Mass Spectrometry. CEC 2006, Jul 2006, Vancouver, Canada. inria-00270874

HAL Id: inria-00270874

<https://inria.hal.science/inria-00270874>

Submitted on 8 Apr 2008

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Protein Sequencing with an Adaptive Genetic Algorithm from Tandem Mass Spectrometry

Jean-Charles Boisson, Laetitia Jourdan, El-Ghazali Talbi and Christian Rolando

Abstract—In Proteomics, only the *de novo peptide sequencing* approach allows a partial amino acid sequence of a peptide to be found from a MS/MS spectrum. In this article a preliminary work is presented to discover a complete protein sequence from spectral data (MS and MS/MS spectra). For the moment, our approach only uses MS spectra. A Genetic Algorithm (GA) has been designed with a new evaluation function which works directly with a complete MS spectrum as input and not with a mass list like the other methods using this kind of data. Thus the mono isotopic peak extraction step which needs a human intervention is deleted. The goal of this approach is to discover the sequence of unknown proteins and to allow a better understanding of the differences between experimental proteins and proteins from databases.

I. INTRODUCTION

Proteomics is a recent research domain which has emerged thanks to the mass spectrometry 10-15 years ago. It can be defined as the global analysis of proteins. The word proteome defines the protein set of an organism. Figure 1 represents a global scheme starting from the genes to the proteins.




Fig. 1

GLOBAL SCHEME: FROM GENOME TO PROTEOME (HUMAN CASE).

The Proteomics main goal is the experimental protein identification. Several general techniques exist and a lot of identification tools can be used to make experimental protein identification (the well known Mascot [1] for example). MS spectra is the most common data used to make a first step of identification. It is a mass/intensity spectrum where each peak generally corresponds to a peptide of the experimental protein. A peptide is a subset of the original protein obtained by a digestion mechanism. In this digestion a protein is cut at specific cleavage points by an enzyme. From a MS spectrum, a mono isotopic mass list is extracted and used for the identification process. In order to make this identification, the Peptide Mass Fingerprinting (PMF) techniques take proteins from databases and theoretically digest them in order to

suit with the experimental data. These methods compare the experimental mass list with theoretical mass lists and allow to find the protein which has the best score [2], [3]. The accuracy of these methods can be increased thanks to tandem mass spectrometry. The tandem mass spectrometry corresponds to using MS/MS spectra in addition of MS spectra. A MS/MS spectrum is also a mass/intensity spectrum but each peak generally corresponds to one ion type. In fact, a MS/MS (or MS^2) is the result of the fragmentation of one peptide. So for each peptide, a MS/MS spectrum is generated. These spectra give more information to identify close proteins than MS spectra [4], [5].

Another way to use MS/MS spectra is to make identification by *de novo sequencing*. Theoretically, if the ions resulting of a peptide fragmentation can be all kept in the right order, the peptide sequence can be found. However, the MS/MS spectra are noisy and only small sequences can be deduced. So the *de novo sequencing* methods manage to find the right peptide sequence to help the protein identification. These methods start from random peptide sequences or from sequences gained by another identification tool in order to find the right peptide sequence thanks to MS/MS spectra [6], [7], [8], [9]. The main problem of this approach is the huge research space of potential peptide sequences. Some optimization methods have been used with good results [10], [8]. Furthermore, the complete identification process need to be assisted by a sequence alignment tool like Blast to be complete.

A complete automatizing of all the *de novo peptide sequencing* process is interesting. But if a complete automatic *de novo sequencing* approach can be used on all the peptides of one protein, a protein can be sequenced. Inspired by this idea, we propose a complete approach for making protein sequencing.

Figure 2 illustrates this approach. From a MS spectrum (peptide level) and MS/MS spectra (ion level), the closest **protein** sequence may be generated. The originality of this work is that whereas all the other approaches use a list of peptide masses manually extracted thanks to a proprietary software from the spectrometer seller, we directly use a MS spectrum issued of the spectrometer. Furthermore discovering protein sequences is the only way to identify proteins unknown from databases. An other interest of protein sequencing is the possibility to detect sequence variations between the experimental protein and its representation in the databases. In this article, the first step of our approach that allows to find the experimental peptide chemical formula is presented. In section II each part of the chosen optimization

Jean-Charles Boisson, Laetitia Jourdan and El-Ghazali Talbi are from the LIFL/INRIA Futurs, Bât M3 (email: boisson.jourdan,talbi@lifl.fr).

Christian Rolando is from the Plateforme de Protéomique / Centre Commun de Spectrométrie de masse, Bât C4 (email: Christian.Rolando@univ-lille1.fr).

All the authors have the same address: (corresponding department, see above) Cité Scientifique 59655 Villeneuve d'Ascq Cedex, FRANCE.




Fig. 2

GENERAL APPROACH SCHEME. "MS"("MS/MS") EVALUATION:
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION WITH A MS (MS/MS) SPECTRUM.

method, a Genetic Algorithm (GA), is exposed. In section III, the statistics concerning the GA behavior and the first results of our approach is presented. Finally, section IV deals with the conclusions and perspectives about this work.

II. A SPECIFIC GENETIC ALGORITHM

In this section the global scheme of our approach is presented with an explanation of the digestion process. Then each GA part is carefully described. Figure 3 represents the actual version of our approach in which only the MS evaluation is proposed.




Fig. 3

ACTUAL APPROACH SCHEME. "MS" EVALUATION: INDIVIDUAL
EVALUATION WITH A MS SPECTRUM.

A. The approach

In this part, the global approach and the theoretical digestion process are presented.

1) *Description*: a protein can be described as a sorted set of peptides. On the one hand a MS spectrum can help to globally identify the peptides which composed the experimental protein without any information on their sequences or their order. On the other hand a MS/MS spectrum which corresponds to a peptide can give information about the peptide sequence. So from MS and MS/MS spectra, the peptide sequences may be available but the peptides may not be necessary in the right order. For the moment, a genetic algorithm has been designed with an new evaluation function working on a MS spectrum in order to find the chemical formulae of the peptides that compounds the experimental protein. Our evaluation function directly compares an experimental spectrum with a simulated spectrum generated from an amino acid sequence. This evaluation function may allow to find the right chemical

formula (and so the right mass) of the peptides. In order to generate a simulated spectrum which can be compared with a MS spectrum, the analyzed protein has to be in a peptide list format. To do that, a theoretical digestion has to be executed. The next paragraph describes the digestion algorithm that we have designed.

2) *The Digestion Process*: in order to be analyzed, experimental proteins are cut by an enzyme before being put in the mass spectrometer: it is the digestion step. There are several kind of enzyme and each of them cuts proteins on specific cleavage point. In fact, each enzyme respects its own cleavage grammar. For example, the trypsin enzyme cuts proteins after the amino acids lysine (K) and arginine (R) if they are not followed by a proline (P). However, in the real digestion process, enzyme can miss cleavage points and so the result peptides can have "miss cleavage". Due to these miss cleavages, the number of potential peptides that can be generated by the digestion process is increased. The developed theoretical digestion algorithm is an linear and iterative algorithm with no limitations in the number of considered miss cleavages.

B. the GA

In our approach, we want to sequence proteins. The search space linked to this goal can be described as follow: according to the size of a protein in amino acids (n) and the number of existing amino acids (20), there are 20^n potential proteins that can be generated. Nevertheless n is unknown. Generally it is in $[100, 10000]$ amino acids. However, bounds can be computed in order to reduce this range according to the experimental protein mass (see "population initialization" part). If we add static and variable post translational modifications, the number of potential proteins (already huge) explodes. So we need an optimization method that can work on very huge search space. That is why a genetic algorithm has been chosen. The initial protein population evolves according to specific crossover and mutation operators [11]. Figure 4 shows the global scheme of a GA.




Fig. 4

THE GENERAL FLOWCHART OF A GENETIC ALGORITHM. p IS THE
PROBABILITY OF MUTATION.

Each part of the GA has been designed for our problem.

1) *Encoding*: For an individual, there are three possible manner to encode it. An individual could be:

- An amino acid chain: it is the simplest representation. At each evaluation, the individual need to be digested (MS evaluation) and fragmented (MS/MS evaluation).
- A peptide list: an individual is digested one time at its initialization, only miss cleavage computation need to be updated when an operator modifies an individual. From the peptide list, it is easy to return to the original amino acid chain. However, to be evaluated with a MS/MS evaluation function, the peptide list needs to be fragmented.
- A ions list: a MS/MS evaluation is direct but returning to peptide level or protein level is very difficult.

Finally, the second representation has been chosen because it is easy to return to protein level and MS evaluation is direct. An individual is a list of peptides (with the number of miss cleavage), each peptide is an amino acid chain and each amino acid can have post-translational modifications.

2) *Population initialization*: population is randomly initialized with a variable size (in amino acids). This size is contained between two bounds which are calculated from the estimated experimental protein mass. From this mass, we compute a minimum protein mass and a maximum protein mass (experimental mass ± 10 percents). The upper (lower) bound is calculated thanks to the maximum (minimum) protein mass and the amino acid that has the smallest (biggest) mass. So a maximum range for the protein size (in amino acid) is obtained. Nevertheless the generated protein mass has to be checked in order to be validated.

3) *Fitness function*: the evaluation function compares an individual, transformed into a theoretical MS spectrum, with an experimental MS spectrum. A major interest of this function is to compare a MS spectrum with a simulated one (peptide by peptide). The evaluation function does not need a mono isotopic mass list extracted from the experimental MS spectrum. In order to generate a simulated spectra, we design a spectrum generator based on a algorithm developed by A.L. Rockwood [12] to compute isotopic distribution. For detail our fitness function, we use the following notations: n is the protein size in amino acids, m is the protein number of peptides, n_a is the number of elements in a chemical formula, n_{xq} is the quantity of element X in a chemical formula and N is the array size that contains a spectrum. N is a very important parameter as its value sets the number of points that describes the spectrum. The higher N is, the more accurate is the spectrum. The used Fast Fourier Transform (FFT) algorithm is in $N \log_2 N$. Figure 5 details the 4 steps

to evaluate an individual.




Fig. 5
EVALUATION OF AN INDIVIDUAL.

We begin from an individual i.e. from a peptide list:

- 1) The peptide list is transformed into a chemical formula list. This step is linear in the protein size: $O(n)$.
- 2) Each chemical formula allows to generate a part of the complete simulated spectrum. To do that, the isotopic distribution of each formula is computed. For an element X, its initial isotopic distribution is computed (X_1 in $O(N)$). Then FFT allows to change to the Fourier space ($O(N \log_2 N)$). In order to find the isotopic distribution for X_q , n_{xq} multiplications are needed ($O(n_{xq} * N)$). The isotopic distributions of each element has to be added together ($O(n_a * N)$). Finally, FFT allows to return to the Euclidian space ($O(N \log_2 N)$). So this step is in:

$$\begin{aligned}
 &O(N + 2N \log_2 N + n_a * n_{xq} * N + n_a * N) \\
 &\Leftrightarrow O(N * (1 + 2 \log_2 N + n_a (n_{xq} + 1))) \\
 &\approx O(N \log_2 N), \quad 1 \ll n_a * n_{xq} \ll N
 \end{aligned}$$

By default, N has a value of $65536(2^{16})$.

- 3) Each part of the simulated spectrum (so each peptide spectrum) is compared with the experimental MS spectrum. A partial score associated to a peptide is calculated. The peptides are classified according to their score:
 - Positive score: good correlation. The peptide appears in the two spectra and the isotopic distribution is very similar (Figure 6, case A).
 - Negative score: bad correlation. There is maybe a peptide in the experimental spectrum but it is not similar to the theoretical peptide (Figure 6, case B).
 - The lowest scoring bound: no correlation. There is nothing in the experimental spectrum (Figure 6, case C). The lowest scoring bound is dynamically

computed according the evaluation function configuration.




Fig. 6

CORRELATION BETWEEN A THEORETICAL PEPTIDE AND THE EXPERIMENTAL SPECTRUM. CASE A: GOOD CORRELATION, CASE B: BAD CORRELATION AND CASE C: NO CORRELATION. M/Z = MASS / CHARGE.

This step is linear in the spectrum point number ($O(N)$).

- 4) The complete theoretical spectrum is finished. Using the peptide partial scores and the global similarity between the two spectra give the individual fitness. This final step is also linear in the spectrum point number ($O(N)$).

The original global complexity of our evaluation function is:

$$O(n + m * (N \log_2 N + N) + N), \quad m \ll n \ll N$$

Step 3 and 4 are computed with step 2, so the complexity become:

$$O(n + m * N \log_2 N), \quad m \ll n \ll N$$

The complexity is not very high but can be very time consuming due to the N value. In order to increase the speed of an individual evaluation, the isotopic distributions of the most common element are computed for a range of atomic quantity. So the multiplication of the step 2 are no longer needed. The speed is increased but the allocated memory also.

An individual evaluation is a resource and time consuming process. For example on a Pentium4 1.9Ghz, a protein of 500 amino acids needs in average one second and 300 Mo of memory (constant value no linked to the protein size, see above) to be evaluated in the default evaluation function configuration. In this configuration, the theoretical spectrum is represented by 65536 points (2^{16}). It can simulate peptides with a mass contained in the interval $[0, 4096]$ (in Da).

The accuracy of the spectrometer is considered to be 10^{-6} . The atomic isotopic distributions already calculated are only based on the C atom quantity used (here 1000), the other atom quantities are deduced from it (X_q means X atom quantity):

$$H_q = 4 * C_q \quad N_q = C_q / 2$$

$$O_q = C_q / 4 \quad S_q = C_q / 8$$

These coefficients have been proposed by the proteomics platform chemists. Thus the isotopic distributions for C from C_1 to C_q , for H from H_1 to $4 * C_q$, ... are computed in the evaluation function initialization. That is why there are 300 Mo of memory reserved, the most part is due to the different isotopic distributions which are already computed.

This evaluation function has been validated by testing it as a simple protein identification tool by PMF. We use the UNIPROT database in FASTA format that can be download at www.expasy.uniprot.org/database/download.shtml.

4) *Operators*: There are two types of operator: the crossover and mutation operators. The crossover operator allows from selected “parents” to generate “children”. The mutation operators make small modifications on the individuals to keep a genetic diversity in the population.

The chosen crossover is the well known 1-point crossover. Two individuals are selected (the parents), a cut point is randomly placed at the same position in the two individuals and they exchange all the information positioned after this cut point. Two new individuals (the children) are obtained, they have information from the two initial individuals but they are different.

Six mutation operators have been designed:

- The peptide insertion: a randomly generated peptide is inserted in the peptide list that represents an individuals. The size of the new peptides (in amino acid) corresponds to the average size of all the peptides that compounds the individuals. This mutation may allow to reach new interesting peptides.
- The peptide deletion: A randomly chosen peptide is deleted. This mutation may allow to increase the individual quality by removing a peptide that penalizes the individual fitness.
- The amino acid insertion: a random amino acid is inserted in a peptide of the individual peptide list. This new amino acid may not generate a new miss cleavage. This mutation increases the peptide size.
- The amino acid deletion: a randomly chosen amino acid is deleted of a peptide of an individuals. As the amino acid insertion, this mutation modifies the peptide size. With this mutation, the peptide size is decreased.
- The amino acid substitution: a randomly chosen amino acid is replaced by another one not randomly chosen.

The new amino acid is taken according a probability linked to the initial amino acid which is replaced. This probability comes from a substitution matrix that gives for each amino acid, the probability to be replaced by another amino acid. The default matrix used is the BLOSUM62 matrix [13] but others matrix can be specified. This mutation may allow to modify the chemical formula of the peptide without changing its size (in amino acid).

- The post-translational modification: a post-translational modification is added on a global peptide or on a amino acid according to the modification. The post-translational modifications are specific to proteins and are very important in the protein activity. Some proteins are only activated thanks to post-translational modifications.




Fig. 7

THE MUTATION OPERATOR: THE SIX TYPES OF MUTATION.

All these mutations, summarized in figure 7, can be classified in two groups: the “tiny” mutations (amino acid insertion/deletion/substitution and post-translational modification) and “small” mutations (peptide insertion/deletion). The “small” mutations have a bigger impact on the individuals fitness than the “tiny” mutations.

As we have six types of mutation, it is difficult to set the probability of each of them. To overcome this problem, we implement an adaptive strategy for calculating the rate of each mutation operator. Many authors have worked on setting automatically probabilities of applying operator [14], [15], [16]. In [17], authors proposed to compute the new rate of mutation by calculating the progress of the j^{th} application of mutation operator M_i , for an individual ind mutated into an individual mut as follows:

$$progress_j(M_i) = \text{Max}(fit(ind), fit(mut)) - fit(ind)$$

With this mechanism, we can evaluate the evolution of the impact of each mutation operator during the GA execution.

Each part of the GA have been detailed. The next section presents the first results of our approach.

III. RESULTS

In this section, the statistics concerning the GA behavior are presented according to different configurations of the parameters. Then a first biological validation of our approach is proposed.

For all the experiments, we have used two types of data:

- 1) Experimental MS spectra: these spectra have been given by the proteomics platform collaborator. They have been produced by a MALDI-TOF mass spectrometer. They correspond to real data from current experiments.
- 2) Simulated MS spectra: these spectra are theoretical spectra we have generated from protein sequences in FASTA format. These type of data are useful to make tests without noise and protein mix. They can be considered as easy instances for our approach. Furthermore, we can generate a lot of data because only protein sequences are needed.

Table I summarizes the proteins used for our first tests.

TABLE I

MAIN DATA USED FOR OUR EXPERIMENTS. APO-AI: APOLIPOPROTEIN-AI, CYT-C: CYTOCHROME-C. EXP: EXPERIMENTAL, SIM: SIMULATED. THE PROTEIN LENGTH IS GIVEN IN AMINO ACIDS (AA) AND THE PROTEIN WEIGHT IN DALTON (DA).

Name	specie	Type	Size(aa)	Weight(Da)
Apo-AI	Human	Exp	0	≈ 36000
Apo-AI	Human	Sim	317	36112.71
Cyt-C	Bovine	Exp	0	≈ 11500
Cyt-C	Bovine	Sim	104	11565.02

The experimental spectra have an estimated size deduced from their MS spectrum but we can not give an estimated length for the experimental amino acid sequence as it is unknown. The simulated spectra have been generated from the corresponding sequence in the UNIPROT database in FASTA format that can be download at www.expasy.uniprot.org/database/download.shtml. So the simulated data sequence length and their weight are easily computed. Take the same protein under the experimental and the simulated format may allow to understand the difficulties linked to experimental data (spectrometer calibration, noise, ...).

A. GA behavior

In order to validate our approach, the GA behavior have to be analyzed. According to the different version we have developed for each part of our GA and all the different parameters, a lot of configuration can be realized. Each configuration test is time expensive due to the evaluation function. So we have developed a parallel version of the GA thanks to the ParadisEO platform [18]. Due to the evaluation function cost, we have decided to parallelize the individual evaluation according to a master/slave scheme.

The master initializes the population, the slaves evaluate it and at each generation, the master computes the crossover, the mutation and the population replacement steps whereas the slaves compute the fitness of the new individuals. This version has been used on the French grid called Grid5000 (www.grid5000.org). For each configuration test, we have made 15 runs to make first statistics on few generations (500). Concerning the crossover and mutation they have been selected as follow:

- crossover rate: it has been set to 0.9 and experimentations have not shown the necessity to modify it.
- mutation rate: it has been set to 0.1 and with this rate, the GA convergence was very slow. So we experiment several rates of mutation in order to find the better one. Finally, we set this rate with a 0.6 value. In the following paragraphs, NAX GA will correspond to the GA with a mutation rate of 0.X without the adaptive mutation. AX will correspond to the GA with a mutation rate of 0.X with the adaptive mutation. Figure 8 shows the convergence improvement with the Apolipoprotein-A1 example. Improve the mutation rate (NA6 curve) allows to obtain the same quality of solutions than the NA1 GA in only 110 generations. At the end of the 500 generations, the individuals have a fitness value 2 times better than they have with the old mutation rate. We can also remark that the distance between the NA1 and NA6 curves is globally the same during the evolution. Thus, the gain is constant during the 500 generations. With this new mutation rate value, the GA behavior is better.




Fig. 8

EVOLUTION OF GA CONVERGENCE ACCORDING TO THE MUTATION RATE VALUE AND THE ADAPTIVE MUTATION ACTIVATION STATE.

Furthermore, figure 8 shows also the convergence improvement when the adaptive mutation is activated. The final individual quality of the NA1 GA is obtained in:

- only 110 generation for the NA6 GA.
- only 20 generation for the A6 GA.

We can remark that the distance between the A6 GA and the NA6 GA increases during the 500 generations. Concerning the final individual quality, comparing to the NA1 GA, the fitness is:

- 2 times better for the NA6 GA.
- 4 times better for the A6 GA. Furthermore, the increasing gain seems to continue in this case.

For each configuration of your GA, the same statistics based on 10 runs will be exposed: the data used (experimental spectrum or simulated spectrum), the optimal fitness with the known protein corresponding to the MS spectrum (only in the case of simulated spectra), the best individual fitness, the fitness mean and the standard deviation. Table II presents these statistics for the GA without adaptive mutation.

TABLE II

GA STATISTICS WITHOUT ADAPTIVE MUTATION. AAI: APO-AI HUMAN, CC: CYT-C BOVIN. S/E: SIMULATED/EXPERIMENTAL SPECTRUM. σ : STANDARD DEVIATION.

Data	Max	Best	Mean	Median	σ
AAI S	78.47	52.8574	45.2751	45.8461	6.4019
AAI E	0	47.7902	36.3106	36.8451	7.3803
CC S	19.4578	15.5672	11.3776	11.324	2.56
CC E	0	44.5161	27.1763	25.7919	7.7616

We can remark that the protein size have an impact of the individual fitness because the fitness obtained for Apo-AI (experimental and simulated spectrum) is higher than the one gained with Cyt-C (experimental and simulated spectrum). Furthermore, the global statistics of our GA are better on simulated data than experimental data. That is due to different factor:

- the spectrometer calibration: as we compare spectra, we estimate that the spectrometers are perfectly calibrated. As the simulated spectra are “perfect” spectra, the GA behavior is better.
- the spectrum noise: with experimental spectra, we have all the information but also noise can be present.
- another proteins: when we gain a MS spectrum, there are not peptides from only one protein. There are always the possibility to have another protein peptides (from the enzyme used for the digestion for example).

TABLE III

GA STATISTICS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL APOLIPOPROTEIN-AI (AAI E) WITH ADAPTIVE MUTATION.

Data	Max	Best	Mean	Median	σ
AAI S	78.47	72.4086	62.8111	68.0562	10.4471
AAI E	0	120.752	105.0315	106.8990	12.6105
CC S	19.4578	17.3078	14.0618	14.6003	2.6220
CC E	0	58.1147	45.1971	46.7804	8.7158

Table III shows the improvement of the experimental Apolipoprotein-AI when the adaptive mutation is activated. In the four cases, the best individual fitness is increased.

As the adaptive mutations are used, analyzing the operator mutation rate variation allows to understand how the GA evolves. The GA evolution is directly linked to the used evaluation function. Figure 9 and 10 show how the operator mutation rates move during the GA evolution for two configuration of the evaluation function. The difference between these two configurations concerns only the coefficient used during the last step of an individual evaluation.




Fig. 9

EVOLUTION OF THE RATE MUTATION ACCORDING TO EACH MUTATION (WITHOUT POST-TRANSLATIONAL MUTATION) WITH DEFAULT EVALUATION FUNCTION CONFIGURATION.

In figure 9, the peptide insertion and the peptide deletion are the mutation operator the most used during the GA. However, in figure 10 the peptide insertion is rapidly penalized whereas the peptide deletion is always the most used mutation operator. Concerning the mutation rate for the operators working on the amino acids (amino acid substitution/deletion/insertion), figure 9 shows that these operators have different evolution curves but globally their probability of being used decrease during the GA evolution. On the contrary, in figure 10 these operators keep the same behavior and their rate do not decrease nor increase.




Fig. 10

EVOLUTION OF THE RATE MUTATION ACCORDING TO EACH MUTATION (WITHOUT POST-TRANSLATIONAL MUTATION) WITH ANOTHER EVALUATION FUNCTION CONFIGURATION.

These results indicate that the configuration of the evaluation function greatly influences the GA behavior.

After the study of the GA behavior, the first results of the actual approach are proposed in the next part.

B. Biological validation

As we have already explained, experimental spectra and simulated spectra have been used to test the GA behavior. In the biological validation process, we used also these two types of data to evaluate the robustness of our result according to the spectrum quality. Our evaluation may allow to find the right peptide chemical formula, so the best individual may have a spectrum very similar to the data used. For example, figure 11 shows the simulated spectrum of one of the best individuals compared to the Apo-AI simulated one. For the moment only the place of the peaks is analyzed, not the peak intensity because the spectrum generation does not compute the peak intensities. A high intensity for a simulated spectrum only indicates that several peptides have the same mass. In figure 11, we remark that the same peaks are globally reached.




Fig. 11

APO-AI SIMULATED SPECTRUM VS BEST INDIVIDUAL SPECTRUM.

However, the peptide masses have also to be analyzed to be sure of the similarity. If the below example is more precisely analyzed (show in table IV), the individual peptides have the right mass for 11 of them or very close mass for 20 of them. In some case, the right sequence is also found. However, having the right chemical formula (so the right mass) does not seem that the same sequence has been found. Only further work on MS/MS data can provide sequence information.

TABLE IV

MATCHING APO-AI PEPTIDES (AAI PEP) AND BEST INDIVIDUAL PEPTIDES. δ IS THE MASS DIFFERENCE, $\delta = (|\text{APO-AI PEPTIDE} - \text{BEST INDIVIDUAL PEPTIDE}| / \text{APO-AI PEPTIDE})$. THERE ARE ALSO 11 EXACT SEQUENCE MATCHES WHICH ARE NOT SHOWN HERE.

AAI pep	δ	AAI pep	δ
278.153837	$9.03 \cdot 10^{-5}$	839.339148	$3.93 \cdot 10^{-5}$
347.229445	$2.9 \cdot 10^{-3}$	886.474654	$2.00 \cdot 10^{-5}$
381.213795	$3.2 \cdot 10^{-5}$	899.441563	$2.05 \cdot 10^{-5}$
561.263264	$7.19 \cdot 10^{-5}$	930.504892	$1.07 \cdot 10^{-3}$
603.335367	$1.64 \cdot 10^{-3}$	938.432714	$9.94 \cdot 10^{-4}$
616.378235	$1.7 \cdot 10^{-3}$	948.526690	$1.18 \cdot 10^{-11}$
678.393885	$1.5 \cdot 10^{-3}$	968.552905	$6.25 \cdot 10^{-5}$
804.373937	$6.03 \cdot 10^{-5}$	1114.585661	$9.72 \cdot 10^{-4}$
817.395676	$2.27 \cdot 10^{-5}$	1247.576887	$1.11 \cdot 10^{-5}$
830.437206	$1.24 \cdot 10^{-3}$	1647.801210	$5.60 \cdot 10^{-6}$

For the moment, our approach can not be compare for the moment to another tool for two main reasons:

- our approach is not complete. The MS/MS evaluation level is not already implemented and it is the next step to reach the protein sequence.
- Only *de novo peptide sequencing* approaches can be compared (with for example the Lutefisk tool). But our approach is designed for making *de novo protein sequencing*.

This approach may be used to give more information of possible protein sequence modifications.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND PERSPECTIVES

A first step for a fundamental approach to identify experimental protein sequence has been proposed. We have designed a GA with a new evaluation function that avoid a needed step in all the other methods using MS spectra: the extraction of the mono isotopic list that needs human intervention via a proprietary software linked to the used spectrometer. The first tests have given interesting results. The individual result of the GA evolution has a MS spectrum closed to the experimental one. Therefore, the right chemical formula are found. Furthermore, the size of each peptide (in amino acids) is also correlated with the data. So the search space is reduced.

However, the peptides of the result individuals generally don't have the right sequence and they are not in the right order. To overcome these problems, (1) MS/MS spectra can be used to find the right peptide sequence and (2) a MS spectrum of the experimental protein gained with another digestion enzyme (for example pepsine) may allow to find the right peptide order that gives the optimal fitness with the new MS spectrum. This approach has been validated by the proteomics platform collaborator and is under implementation.

Moreover, the study of the GA behavior has shown that the current crossover used (the 1-point crossover) is not effective.

So two main possibilities to increase the GA behavior can be proposed:

- Try other types of crossover or design a specific crossover for our problem.
- Avoid the crossover utilization by using an another optimization method, for example the taboo search.

Finally, this work may give a new way to analyze proteins where the other methods do not give results.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Perkins, D. Pappin, D. Creasy, and J. Cottrell, "Probability-based protein identification by searching sequence databases using mass spectrometry data," *Electrophoresis*, vol. 20, pp. 3551–3567, 1999.
- [2] R. Gras, M. Müller, E. Gasteiger, P. B. S. Gay, W. Bienvenut, C. Hoogland, J. Sanchez, A. Bairoch, D. Hochstrasser, and R. Appel, "Improving protein identification from peptide mass fingerprinting through a parameterized multi-level scoring algorithm and an optimized peak detection," *Electrophoresis*, vol. 20, pp. 3535–3550, 1999.
- [3] F. Monigatti and P. Berndt, "Algorithm for accurate similarity measurements of peptide mass fingerprints and its application," *American Society for Mass Spectrometry*, vol. 16, pp. 13–21, 2005.
- [4] V. Bafna and N. Edwards, "Scope: A probabilistic model for scoring tandem mass spectra against a peptide database," *Bioinformatics*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 1–9, 2001.
- [5] J. Magnin, A. Masselot, C. Menzel, and J. Colinge, "OLAV-PMF: a novel scoring scheme for high-throughput peptide mass fingerprinting," *Journal of Proteome Research*, vol. 3, pp. 55–60, 2004.
- [6] V. Dancik, T. Addon, and K. Clauser, "De novo peptide sequencing via tandem mass spectrometry," *Journal of Computational Biology*, vol. 6, no. 3/4, pp. 327–342, 1999.
- [7] A. Frank and P. Pevzner, "Pepnovo: de novo peptide sequencing via probabilistic network," *Analytical Chemistry*, vol. 77, pp. 964–973, 2005.
- [8] J. Marlar, A. Heredia-langner, D. B. K.H., Jarman, and W. Cannon, "Constrained de novo peptide identification via multi-objective optimization," in *International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium*, 2004, p. 191a.
- [9] B. Searle, S. Dasari, M. Turner, A. Reddy, D. Choi, P. Wilmarth, A. McCormack, L. David, and S. Nagalla, "High-throughput identification of proteins and unanticipated sequence modifications using a mass-based alignment algorithm for MS/MS de novo sequencing results," *Analytical Chemistry*, vol. 76, pp. 2220–2230, 2004.
- [10] A. Heredia-Langner, W. Cannon, K. Jarman, and K. Jarman, "Sequence optimization as an alternative to de novo analysis of tandem mass spectrometry data," *Bioinformatics*, vol. 20, no. 14, pp. 2296–2304, 2004.
- [11] J. Holland, *Adaptation in Natural and Artificial Systems*. University of Michigan Press, 1975.
- [12] A. Rockwood, S. V. Orden, and R. Smith, "Rapid Calculation of Isotope Distribution," *Analytical Chemistry*, vol. 67, no. 15, pp. 2698–2704, 1995.
- [13] S. Henikoff and J. Henikoff, "Amino acid substitution matrices from protein blocks," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 89, pp. 10 915–10 919, 1992.
- [14] L. Davis, "Adapting operator probabilities in genetic algorithms," in *Third International Conference on Genetic Algorithms*, J. D. Schaffer, Ed. Morgan Kaufmann, 1989, pp. 61–69, san Mateo, CA.
- [15] B. A. Julstrom, "What have you done for me lately? adapting operator probabilities in a steady-state genetic algorithm," in *Proceedings of the sixth International Conference on Genetic Algorithms*, L. J. Eshelman, Ed. Morgan Kaufmann, 1995, pp. 81–87, san Francisco, CA.

- [16] Francisco Herrera and M. Lozano, "Adaptation of genetic algorithm parameters based on fuzzy logic controllers," in *Genetic Algorithms and Soft Computing*, F. Herrera and J. L. Verdegay, Eds. Heidelberg: Physica-Verlag, 1996, pp. 95–125. [Online]. Available: citeseer.nj.nec.com/104774.html
- [17] T. P. Hong, H. Wang, and W. Chen, "Simultaneously applying multiple mutation operators in genetic algorithms," *Journal of Heuristics*, vol. 6, pp. 439 – 455, 2000.
- [18] S. Cahon, N. Melab, and E.-G. Talbi, "ParadisEO: A Framework for the Reusable Design of Parallel and Distributed Metaheuristics," *Journal of Heuristics*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 357–380, May 2004.